



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/692,174

10/23/2003

Benjamin N. Eldridge

P47C2-US

8347

50905

7590

04/04/2006

N. KENNETH BURRASTON

KIRTON & MCCONKIE

P.O. BOX 45120

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,174

Applicant(s)

ELDRIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26, 32-36, 41-43, 48, 73-85, 87-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26, 32-36, 41-43, 48, 73-85, 87-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION


The request for continued examination is acknowledged. All amendments are entered.

1. Claims 26, 32-36, 41-43, 48, 73-85, 87-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faraci in view of Fjelstad, Babuka, Abys and Yanof.
2. For claim 26, Faraci, figure 5B, 3C, 3D, discloses a contacts (probes) used for testing, each with base or post 180 and body 200, the base secured to substrate 110, and the body having a tip 320. The tips may be of a hard metal such as gold while the base and body would typical be copper. Faraci does not disclose the tip as formed of palladium. Yanof uses a palladium tip 35 on a contact body formed of nickel, column 5, lines 30-42. Fjelstad discloses tips with caps 34, 318 that may be palladium for hardness and sharpness. Babuka uses hard noble metal for tip 25. Abys, column 1 added for further discussion of advantages of palladium for surface contact. Therefore obvious to use palladium for tip 320 to provide hardness, sharpness, etc. and for lower contact resistance. Note that the Faraci body and post are not of palladium.
3. For claim 32, Fjelstad discloses "palladium alloy". Abys states palladium cobalt alloy to be useful for electrical contacts. Therefore obvious to use such alloy for Faraci tip. Dependent claims and other claims covered by above discussion. Use of specific pitch and specific test object define no structure over prior art.
4. Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment, see above discussion have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The remarks point out no special

Art Unit: 2839

advantage for the choice of palladium for its well-known characteristics. Use of palladium in place of gold for contact tips would be an obvious variation

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089


NEIL ABRAMS
PRIMARY EXAMINER